

**COMBINED PROJECT INFORMATION DOCUMENTS / INTEGRATED  
SAFEGUARDS DATA SHEET (PID/ISDS)  
ADDITIONAL FINANCING**

**Report No.:** PIDISDSA15927

**Date Prepared/Updated:** 22-Mar-2016

**I. BASIC INFORMATION**

**A. Basic Project Data**

<b>Country:</b>	St. Vincent and the Grenadines	<b>Project ID:</b>	P157918
		<b>Parent Project ID (if any):</b>	P117871
<b>Project Name:</b>	St. Vincent and the Grenadines RDVRP AF (P157918)		
<b>Parent Project Name:</b>	Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction APL1 - Grenada and St. Vincent and the Grenadines (P117871)		
<b>Region:</b>	LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN		
<b>Estimated Appraisal Date:</b>	18-Mar-2016	<b>Estimated Board Date:</b>	27-Oct-2016
<b>Practice Area (Lead):</b>	Social, Urban, Rural and Resilience Global Practice	<b>Lending Instrument:</b>	Investment Project Financing
<b>Borrower(s):</b>	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning		
<b>Implementing Agency:</b>	Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning		
<b>Financing (in USD Million)</b>			
	<b>Financing Source</b>		<b>Amount</b>
	Borrower		0.00
	European Commission Development Fund - TF		6.81
	Financing Gap		0.00
	Total Project Cost		6.81
<b>Environmental Category:</b>	B - Partial Assessment		
<b>Appraisal Review Decision (from Decision Note):</b>	The review did authorize the team to appraise and negotiate		
<b>Other Decision:</b>			
<b>Is this a Repeater project?</b>	No		

## **B. Introduction and Context**

### **Country Context**

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (SVG) is a small, upper-middle income country with an estimated population of 110,000 and a GDP per capita of USD 6,663 (2014). The economic recovery from the last global financial crisis was adversely affected by severe floods and landslides, which hit the country at end-2013. GDP grew by 1.2 percent in 2012 and 1.8 percent in 2013, but declined by 0.5 percent in 2014 partially due to the negative impact of the floods on agriculture and the disruption of transport infrastructure. Debt continues to increase as the debt-to-GDP ratio rose from 74 percent in 2013 to 77 percent in 2014. The last poverty assessment in 2008 measured poverty at 30 percent with an additional 18 percent of the population at risk to falling into poverty. The recent climatic disasters are likely to weaken growth and widen macroeconomic imbalances in the near term. However, a gradual economic recovery is expected over time. In the medium term, growth is projected to approach 3.0 percent per annum starting in 2016 given reconstruction and rehabilitation efforts.

SVG is exposed to high levels of risk to meteorological and geophysical hazards, which have significant negative impacts on SVG's economic and fiscal stability. These natural hazards are being exacerbated by the adverse impacts of climate change, which are putting increased stress on coastal investments, national infrastructure, water availability and livelihoods, especially of the poor and vulnerable groups in SVG. GermanWatch, based on data from Munich Re NatCatSERVICE, estimated that the average annual loss from weather related disasters from 1994-2014 was 1.7% of GDP. The Government's gross debt relative to GDP was 77 percent in 2014 - giving the country limited capacity to manage the fiscal impacts of exogenous shocks.

In addition, on December 24, 2013, a tropical weather trough passed over SVG producing extraordinarily intense rainfall resulting in severe damages and 9 confirmed deaths. A rapid Damage and Loss Assessment (DaLA) carried out by the Government in close collaboration with the World Bank estimated that the combined physical damage and economic losses were approximately USD 108.4 million (15 percent of GDP). GermanWatch reported that in 2013 SVG was the 5th most affected country to natural disasters in the world.

### **Sectoral and institutional Context**

The Additional Finance (AF) is as a result of the December 2013 flooding event that occurred in SVG and which caused total estimated damages and losses of USD 108.4 million (approximately 15 percent of national GDP). Various donors and financiers including Mexico, Uruguay, European Union, the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) as well as the World Bank, committed resources, in-kind support or technical assistance to support the country's post-disaster reconstruction and rehabilitation. The activities identified under the AF complement these proposed activities and will be used to rehabilitate and reconstruct infrastructure that have not been addressed with earlier interventions.

Consistency with the Regional Partnership Strategy. Reducing vulnerability and building resilience to risk from natural hazards and climate change is also a core element of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Regional Partnership Strategy (RPS) FY15-FY19.

## **C. Proposed Development Objective(s)**

### **Original Project Development Objective(s) - Parent**

The Program aims at measurably reducing vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The objective of the Project in Grenada is to measurably reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in Grenada and in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The objective of the Project in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines is to measurably reduce vulnerability to natural hazards and climate change impacts in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and in the Eastern Caribbean Sub-region. The achievement of the Program Development Objectives of the Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Program (RDVRP) would be measured using the following key indicators: (a) Reduced risk of OECS population to failure of public buildings and infrastructure due to natural hazards or climate change impacts; and (b) Increased capacity of OECS Governments to identify and monitor climate risk and impacts.

### **Key Results**

Activities financed under the proposed AF are expected to benefit the entire population of SVG as local and national infrastructures will be improved and made more resilient. Additional economic payoffs are further anticipated from enhanced disaster and climate risk reduction resulting from project works over the long-term. More specifically, under the proposed AF interventions, additional beneficiaries may include: the communities of (i) Ginger Village; (ii) Chateaubelair; and (iii) Congo Valley in particular, some of whom run the risk of losing access to part of the island, including the major health and education facilities and farms, following a major storm event. These communities are among some of the poorest in SVG with poverty levels ranging from 32.4 to 55.6 percent, which are all above the national average of 30.2 percent.

## **D. Project Description**

The proposed AF is expected to increase the development impact of the Parent Project, within the scope of the current development objectives. AF funds will exclusively support Component 1 and Component 4 of the Parent Project. Activities financed by the proposed AF are consistent with interventions included under the Parent Project in that they focus on investments in the transport and coastal management sectors. Specifically, AF activities would further reduce vulnerability to climate change by potentially financing: (a) reconstruction of the Chateaubelair jetty; and (b) rehabilitation of road infrastructure, including potentially: (i) realignment and upgrading of the Ginger Village road; (ii) reconstruction of bridge #2 and associated road works in Congo Valley; (iii) rehabilitation of Longline Bridge and road; and (iv) reconstruction of feeder roads. In addition, AF activities would scale-up overall project management, and in particular to provide adequate financial management support and technical support for supervision of civil works and to enhance the capacity of the Ministry of Transport and Works (MoTW) (through consultancies).

### **Component Name**

Component 1: Prevention and Adaptation Investments

### **Comments (optional)**

### **Component Name**

Component 4: Project Management and Implementation Support

### **Comments (optional)**

## **E. Project location and salient physical characteristics relevant to the safeguard analysis (if known)**

## **F. Environmental and Social Safeguards Specialists**

Cristina Elizabeth Coirolo (GSU04)

M. Yaa Pokua Afriyie Oppong (GSU04)

Michael J. Darr (GEN04)

## **II. Implementation**

### **Institutional and Implementation Arrangements**

The general procurement, disbursement and safeguards arrangements of the Parent Project have been satisfactory, are appropriate to absorb additional funds, and will continue under the proposed AF. The PMU within Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning's (MoFEP) Central Planning Division (CPD) is sufficiently staffed. In-country capacity for environmental management is satisfactory as the PMU provides a Senior Civil Engineer and a Project Engineer with previous and ongoing experience in World Bank projects, to ensure compliance with World Bank environmental requirements. These Project engineers also support the Ministry of Transport and Works; this has resulted in a level of technical performance that is exemplary. An additional environmental support staff within the PMU is being trained to provide environmental safeguards support. The capacity of the PMU to manage involuntary resettlement and the broader social safeguard aspects of the project has improved through the implementation of previous investments including under the recently closed Hurricane Tomas Emergency Recovery Loan and the ongoing Parent Project. The Social Development Team has been enhanced by assigning four individuals, including two Project Officers and two Economists. The capacity to manage social impacts is considered satisfactory. Targeted training has facilitated capacity development to manage and coordinate Bank-supported projects. Technical assistance (i.e. consultants) in contract management, supervision of works and other areas may be required to increase capacity of the implementing agency in executing and monitoring the new activities, for which AF resources will be allocated.

## **III. Safeguard Policies that might apply**

<b>Safeguard Policies</b>	<b>Triggered?</b>	<b>Explanation (Optional)</b>
Environmental Assessment OP/BP 4.01	Yes	The Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the Parent Project was updated for the first AF early in 2014, and the new AF includes subprojects of similar typologies; therefore, no substantial revision to the EMF is required. The EMF provides screening methods and procedures for the application of Bank safeguards, including guidance on the scope of studies necessary to complete for each subproject, criteria for triggering additional studies in the case of complex or significant activities, and a generic

		Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for use in simple situations where activities need no additional assessment. The studies and management plans related to each subproject should be completed prior to the start of any works on a particular subproject. It is likely that the majority of works will be relatively minor in nature and involve simple civil works where the environmental impacts are limited to the construction phase, requiring only the application of a standardized generic EMP. However, any exceptions will be identified during screening in the EMF, and subject to additional assessment work.
Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04	Yes	This safeguard had been triggered in the Parent Project as a precaution due to potential project activities which may occur in highland forest areas, river valleys, coastlines and/or marine areas. During project preparation of the AF, potentially sensitive areas were identified in road works (Congo Valley and Longline Bridge) and jetty works (Chateubelair), which will be managed using screening procedures already established in the EMF to require additional assessment during implementation.
Forests OP/BP 4.36	No	Additional research and subsequent definition of sub-projects during project preparation have shown that this safeguard will not be triggered. Planned watershed management activities and slope stabilization works will not impact the management, protection and/or utilization of forests nor are any projects involving harvesting or converting forest resources considered under the project.
Pest Management OP 4.09	Yes	There are no plans presently to include sub-projects which involve the use the pesticides, herbicides or activities relate to the management of pests, other than incidental pesticide use (e.g. termite treatment for building foundations). As the use is not significant, no separate Pest Management Plan is required; instead, the EMF includes appropriate procedures in the form of a generic standardized EMP for incorporation into contract clauses.

Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11	Yes	While no works have been identified in sensitive areas, this safeguard is triggered as there is the small likelihood for encountering sites of cultural historical significance, particularly in the case of new construction. The EMF provides for assessment and policy requirements, and procedures for chance find will be provided together with appropriate small works contract clauses.
Indigenous Peoples OP/BP 4.10	No	The social assessment undertaken for the Parent Project concluded that no indigenous communities are present in the Project area, therefore OP/BP 4.10 is not triggered. Extra due diligence was given in the social assessment to one Indigenous Peoples descendant community residing in the Sandy Bay area given their relatively higher levels of poverty. However, this community resides outside the area of AF investment.
Involuntary Resettlement OP/ BP 4.12	Yes	It is likely that several of the sub-project sites under AF could lead to land acquisition, depending on final designs. Any potentially negative impacts with respect to land acquisition and/or resettlement will be mitigated by the presence of a Social Development Team, within the PMU, tasked with community outreach and consultation to affected persons, and the development and implementation of Resettlement Action Plans and associated compensatory and mitigatory measures in line with the Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF) developed for the Parent Project. The RPF provides guidelines for the development of instruments to mitigate social impacts that may result from works undertaken for the Parent Project, and will be updated to reflect the additional investments, however does not require substantive revision given that the activities planned under the AF are similar in nature and extent to those under the Parent Project.
Safety of Dams OP/BP 4.37	No	OP/BP 4.37 has not been triggered as flood control works and river defense structures are a few meters high (at most).
Projects on International Waterways OP/BP 7.50	No	Planned works under the project are exclusively located within the territory of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and not in the proximity of any International Waterways, as defined by OP/BP 7.50.
Projects in Disputed Areas OP/ BP 7.60	No	Planned works under the project are exclusively located within the territory of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and not in the proximity of any Disputed

		Areas, as defined by OP/BP 7.60.
--	--	----------------------------------

#### IV. Key Safeguard Policy Issues and Their Management

##### A. Summary of Key Safeguard Issues

**1. Describe any safeguard issues and impacts associated with the proposed project. Identify and describe any potential large scale, significant and/or irreversible impacts:**

In accordance with Bank environmental safeguards requirements, the project has been classified as Category B, and the policy on Environmental Assessment (OP 4.01) is triggered.

Environmental Safeguards. The Government prepared an extensive revision to the program-level EMF in early 2014 for the first AF. The EMF describes the screening procedures to identify sub-projects in environmentally complex settings or with potentially significant impacts (if unmitigated) which must therefore have individual Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) prepared as required during implementation along with subproject-specific mitigation measures. For relatively uncomplicated projects, the EMF includes generic mitigation measures through the development of a generic EMP, referenced in the Operations Manual and to be included in future environmental compliance contracting clauses. The EMF specifically responds to the types of projects/sub-projects under Components 1 and 4 and also include standard procedures for mitigating environmental impacts of construction, monitoring and reporting. The EMF assesses sub-projects of similar typologies to the new proposed AF, therefore, no substantial revision to the EMF is required, but only minor updates to the list of sub-projects and a clarification that the Pest Management Policy is triggered (see discussion below) for incidental use such as termite treatment of building foundations.

Natural Habitats OP/BP 4.04. The EMF accounts for natural habitats when screening both known works and any future activities currently undefined. Most works in the parent project portfolio will not affect natural habitats, and only a few have been identified with the potential to do so (interior roadworks at Fenton Road – Green Hill, and various coastal works). During AF assessment, potentially sensitive areas were identified in two similar interior roads (Congo Valley and Longline Bridge) and one coastal work (Chateubelair jetty), both very similar to the parent project works. The EMF contains guidance and procedures for screening future projects and triggering additional studies at these sites. During project implementation, candidate work sites will be identified and reviewed for potential application of this policy. In the case of future undefined works, this policy along with all other Bank safeguards has been included in the screening procedures provided under the project EMF.

Forests OP/BP 4.36. Forest resource harvesting is not included in any project interventions, nor are there any proposals to develop integrated watershed management plans or other activities with possible implications for forest management. Additional research and subsequent definition of sub-projects during project preparation have shown that this safeguard will not be triggered. Planned slope stabilization works will not impact the management, protection and/or utilization of forests nor are any projects involving harvesting or converting forest resources considered under the project.

Pest Management OP 4.09. This safeguard has been triggered, as subproject activities may require the purchase or use of small amounts of pesticide through licensed registered professional contractors (e.g. termite treatment for building foundations). Use or purchase of significant

amounts of pesticides is excluded in the EMF by screening as well as through standard contract clauses, therefore no separate Pest Management Plan is required; instead, the EMF includes appropriate procedures in the generic standardized EMP for incorporation into contract clauses.

Physical Cultural Resources OP/BP 4.11. This safeguard is triggered as a precaution as project activities may potentially include historical building retrofits, restoration of culturally significant structures, and chance finds of historically or culturally significant resources during construction of works. The EMF includes screening for historical structures as well as a "chance-find" procedure, particularly during activities such as major excavations, road realignments or similar works where such assets could be affected.

Involuntary Resettlement OP/BP 4.12. This safeguard is triggered given the likelihood that several of the sub-project sites under Parent Project and AF could lead to the necessity to acquire land, depending on final designs. Any potentially negative impacts with respect to land acquisition and/or resettlement would be minor in nature and will be mitigated by the presence of a Social Development Team, within the PMU, tasked with community outreach and consultation to affected persons, and the development and implementation of RAPs and associated compensatory and mitigating measures in line with the RPF developed for the Parent Project.

**2. Describe any potential indirect and/or long term impacts due to anticipated future activities in the project area:**

The Project neither stimulates negative indirect impacts nor induces future activities in the project areas. Benefits and positive impacts will accrue from the improved resiliency of infrastructure and the increased capacity of the Government in managing environmental aspects.

No potential long term or indirect social impacts are anticipated. The social benefits of the Parent Project are expected to be positive and will remain so under the AF. Improved infrastructure resilience in the transport and coastal management sectors will likely lead to reduced flooding exposure and reduced disruptions in the lives of the relevant communities and will promote an increased sense of safety and security.

**3. Describe any project alternatives (if relevant) considered to help avoid or minimize adverse impacts.**

Studies for coastal defenses and road works include alternative evaluations as part of the engineering and design efforts, to avoid or minimize potential adverse impacts.

**4. Describe measures taken by the borrower to address safeguard policy issues. Provide an assessment of borrower capacity to plan and implement the measures described.**

The Project Management Unit (PMU) within the Central Planning Division (CPD) will manage the supervision of environmental compliance, while receiving technical support from the Ministry of Transport and Works (MoTW). The PMU has staffed a full-time Field Supervision Engineer with experience on similar projects (Hurricane Tomas Emergency Recovery) and so is familiar with environmental requirements; a new staff member within the PMU is also being trained. In addition to Bank requirements, the PMU will also be responsible for (a) ensuring the proper application of national environmental laws, (b) ensuring environmental compliance in accordance with procedures detailed in the project's Operations Manual and (c) reflecting such requirements in associated works contracts. The PMU has also staffed a Senior Project Engineer with abundant experience to help guide the execution of the project, ensure that environmental protection measures are implemented by contractors, and otherwise provide support to the Project.



Technical staff of participating Ministries will assist with contract supervision.

A World Bank Environmental Specialist will further provide additional technical support by periodic field supervision. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and terms of reference will be forwarded to the Bank for review. EIAs produced will be forwarded to the Bank for review prior to the development of specific works contracts. All works contracts requiring an EIA will be subject to prior review and supervision missions will review project activities with respect to environmental compliance.

On the Social Safeguards, the capacity of the PMU to manage involuntary resettlement and broader social impacts has been enhanced during the implementation of previous investments including the Hurricane Tomas Emergency Recovery Loan and the RDVRP/Parent Project. There are 4 staff within the PMU responsible for the social aspects and they have the requisite skills and experience to incorporate the AF activities into the Parent Project.

**5. Identify the key stakeholders and describe the mechanisms for consultation and disclosure on safeguard policies, with an emphasis on potentially affected people.**

The majority of works contemplated involve the repair and retrofitting of existing infrastructure. In these cases, impacts to stakeholders will relate to temporary inconveniences, and potential land acquisition and/or resettlement associated with construction activities, and will be managed to minimize impacts to the greatest extent possible. Advanced public notifications will inform potentially affected persons, who, if necessary, will be compensated prior to works. Relevant line ministries will assist MoTW and the PMU in these efforts.

When subproject-specific safeguards instruments, (Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs), Social Impact Assessments (SIAs) or Resettlement Action Plans (RAPs)) are required, specific stakeholders will be identified and public meetings will be conducted to enable the reflection of stakeholder concerns in project design. These requirements will be incorporated into the terms of reference for EIAs and SIAs. In the case of land acquisition, the Project affected peoples (PAPs) will be consulted in the identification, development, and implementation of the mitigation measures.

The updated EMF and RPF have been disclosed and subject to public comment, as were the original EMF and RPF for the Parent Project. The EMF for the Parent Project was disclosed on March 21, 2011 and the updated EMF with AF activities was disclosed on March 3, 2016. The original RPF was disclosed on April 28th, 2011; the updated version was disclosed on March 3, 2016.

***B. Disclosure Requirements***

<b>Environmental Assessment/Audit/Management Plan/Other</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	02-Mar-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Mar-2016
For category A projects, date of distributing the Executive Summary of the EA to the Executive Directors	
<b>"In country" Disclosure</b>	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	03-Mar-2016

<i>Comments:</i> <a href="http://www.gov.vc/images/stories/pdf_documents/EMF_March_2016.pdf">http://www.gov.vc/images/stories/pdf_documents/EMF_March_2016.pdf</a>	
<b>Resettlement Action Plan/Framework/Policy Process</b>	
Date of receipt by the Bank	01-Mar-2016
Date of submission to InfoShop	04-Mar-2016
"In country" Disclosure	
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	03-Mar-2016
<i>Comments:</i> <a href="http://www.gov.vc/images/stories/pdf_documents/resettlementpolicyframeworkmarch2016.pdf">http://www.gov.vc/images/stories/pdf_documents/resettlementpolicyframeworkmarch2016.pdf</a>	
<b>Pest Management Plan</b>	
Was the document disclosed prior to appraisal?	NA
Date of receipt by the Bank	NA
Date of submission to InfoShop	NA
"In country" Disclosure	
<i>Comments:</i>	
<b>If the project triggers the Pest Management and/or Physical Cultural Resources policies, the respective issues are to be addressed and disclosed as part of the Environmental Assessment/Audit/or EMP.</b>	
<b>If in-country disclosure of any of the above documents is not expected, please explain why:</b>	
The Pest Management Policy has been triggered in case of incidental pesticide use (e.g. termite treatment for building foundations), as needed. As the quantities will not be significant, no separate Pest Management Plan has been developed; instead, the EMF includes appropriate procedures in the form of a generic standardized EMP for incorporation into contract clauses.	

### ***C. Compliance Monitoring Indicators at the Corporate Level***

<b>OP/BP/GP 4.01 - Environment Assessment</b>	
Does the project require a stand-alone EA (including EMP) report?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If yes, then did the Regional Environment Unit or Practice Manager (PM) review and approve the EA report?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
Are the cost and the accountabilities for the EMP incorporated in the credit/loan?	Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP/BP 4.04 - Natural Habitats</b>	
Would the project result in any significant conversion or degradation of critical natural habitats?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]
If the project would result in significant conversion or degradation of other (non-critical) natural habitats, does the project include mitigation measures acceptable to the Bank?	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ]
<b>OP 4.09 - Pest Management</b>	
	Yes [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] No [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] NA [ <input type="checkbox"/> ]

Does the EA adequately address the pest management issues?	
Is a separate PMP required?	Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, has the PMP been reviewed and approved by a safeguards specialist or PM? Are PMP requirements included in project design? If yes, does the project team include a Pest Management Specialist?	Yes [ ] No [ ] NA [ ]
<b>OP/BP 4.11 - Physical Cultural Resources</b>	
Does the EA include adequate measures related to cultural property?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Does the credit/loan incorporate mechanisms to mitigate the potential adverse impacts on cultural property?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
<b>OP/BP 4.12 - Involuntary Resettlement</b>	
Has a resettlement plan/abbreviated plan/policy framework/process framework (as appropriate) been prepared?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
If yes, then did the Regional unit responsible for safeguards or Practice Manager review the plan?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Is physical displacement/relocation expected?  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ ] No [ ] TBD [ × ]
Is economic displacement expected? (loss of assets or access to assets that leads to loss of income sources or other means of livelihoods)  Provided estimated number of people to be affected	Yes [ ] No [ ] TBD [ × ]
<b>The World Bank Policy on Disclosure of Information</b>	
Have relevant safeguard policies documents been sent to the World Bank's Infoshop?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Have relevant documents been disclosed in-country in a public place in a form and language that are understandable and accessible to project-affected groups and local NGOs?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
<b>All Safeguard Policies</b>	
Have satisfactory calendar, budget and clear institutional responsibilities been prepared for the implementation of measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Have costs related to safeguard policy measures been included in the project cost?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Does the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the project include the monitoring of safeguard impacts and measures related to safeguard policies?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]
Have satisfactory implementation arrangements been agreed with the borrower and the same been adequately reflected in the project legal documents?	Yes [ × ] No [ ] NA [ ]

## V. Contact point

**World Bank**

Contact: Tiguist Fisseha  
 Title: Senior Disaster Risk Management

**Borrower/Client/Recipient**

Name: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning  
 Contact: Laura Anthony Browne  
 Title: Director of Planning  
 Email: cenplan@svgcpd.com

**Implementing Agencies**

Name: Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning  
 Contact: Laura Anthony Browne  
 Title: Director of Planning  
 Email: cenplan@svgcpd.com

**VI. For more information contact:**

The InfoShop  
 The World Bank  
 1818 H Street, NW  
 Washington, D.C. 20433  
 Telephone: (202) 458-4500  
 Fax: (202) 522-1500  
 Web: <http://www.worldbank.org/infoshop>

**VII. Approval**

Task Team Leader(s):	Name: Tiguist Fisseha	
<b><i>Approved By</i></b>		
Safeguards Advisor:	Name: Francis V. Fragano (SA)	Date: 28-Mar-2016
Practice Manager/ Manager:	Name: Markus Kostner (PMGR)	Date: 05-Apr-2016
Country Director:	Name: Francisco Galrao Carneiro (CD)	Date: 05-Aug-2016